

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF VERMONT
FILED

2009 AUG 21 AM 10:53

TIMOTHY H. SHEA,
Plaintiffs,

v.

WILLIAM H. FORRENCE and
PETER CORNELIN FORRENCE,
Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO.:

2:09-cv-176

BY lw CLERK
DEPUTY CLERK

ANSWER

Defendants William H. Forrence and Peter Cornelin Forrence, by and through their attorneys, Lynn, Lynn & Blackman, P.C., hereby answer complaint as follows:

I. Parties

1. Defendant is without knowledge or information to enable it to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph, and therefore denies same.
2. Admitted.
3. Admitted.

II. JURISDICTION

4. The allegations of this paragraph constitute a legal conclusion to which no response is required.

III. FACTS

5. Admitted.

Lynn, Lynn
& Blackman, P.C.

76 St. Paul Street,
Suite 400
Burlington, VT 05401
(802) 860-1500

6. Defendant is without knowledge or information to enable it to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of this paragraph, and therefore denies same.
7. Admitted.
8. Denied.
9. Denied.
10. Denied.

**COUNT I: NEGLIGENT OPERATION OF A MOTOR VEHICLE
RESULTING IN BODILY INJURY AND PROPERTY DAMAGE**

11. Defendant reaffirms and realleges its responses to Paragraphs 1-10 of this Answer and incorporates each herein.
12. Denied.
13. Denied.
14. Admitted.
15. Denied.
16. Denied.
17. Admitted.
18. The allegations of this paragraph constitute a legal conclusion to which no response is required.
19. Denied.
20. The allegations of this paragraph constitute a legal conclusion to which no response is required.

Lynn, Lynn
& Blackman, P.C.

76 St. Paul Street,
Suite 400
Burlington, VT 05401
(802) 860-1500

**COUNT II: NEGLIGENT ENTRUSTMENT OF A MOTOR VEHICLE
RESULTING IN BODILY INJURY AND PROPERTY DAMAGE**

21. Defendant reaffirms and realleges its responses to Paragraphs 1-20
of this Answer and incorporates each herein.
22. Denied.
23. Denied.
24. Denied.
25. Denied.
26. Denied.
27. Admitted.
28. The allegations of this paragraph constitute a legal conclusion to which
no response is required.
29. Denied.
30. Denied.
31. The allegations of this paragraph constitute a legal conclusion to which
no response is required.

JURY DEMAND

Defendants demand trial by jury.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. Comparative negligence.
2. Assumption of the risks.
3. Statute of limitations.
4. Failure to state a claim.

Lynn, Lynn
& Blackman, P.C.

76 St. Paul Street,
Suite 400
Burlington, VT 05401
(802) 860-1500

5. Failure to mitigate damages.
6. Intervening cause.

Dated at Burlington, Vermont this 20th day of August, 2009.

WILLIAM H. FORRENCE and
PETER CORNELIN FORRENCE

By: 

Pietro J. Lynn, Esq.
Lynn, Lynn & Blackman, P.C.
Attorneys for Defendants
76 St. Paul Street, Suite 400
Burlington, VT 05401

c: Joseph S. Provanzano, Esq.

Lynn, Lynn
& Blackman, P.C.

76 St. Paul Street,
Suite 400
Burlington, VT 05401
(802) 860-1500